



*** communism is treason! * fight it with common sense!**

The Nation's Anti-Communist Newspaper

Common Sense

Copyright Registered 1948 United States Patent Office.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
(24 issues annually)
Plain envelope, unsealed . . . \$1.
Plain envelope, sealed . . . \$3.
Foreign & Canada, (10 mos) \$1.

"The Truth, the whole Truth,
and nothing but the Truth"

Without fear or favor,
Charles H. Colley
FOUNDER AND EDITOR

Issue No. 290 (12th Year)

Union, New Jersey, U.S.A., Dec. 15, 1957

Entered as Second Class Matter
January 27, 1946, at the Post Office at Union, N. J.,
under the Act of March 3, 1879

Five Cents

Taxpayers Useless Financing Of NATO Bleeding America!

Collective Defense

STRENGTH OR PERIL?

By Bonner Fellers

Brigadier General, U.S. Army, (Retired)

The Red Satellites have moved our President to set up a crash defense program. It includes the pooling of NATO scientific knowledge, defense reorganization and closer NATO ties. But the President has reserved, possibly for a later date, the discussion of his recent joint agreement with British Prime Minister Macmillan. The agreement begins:

"1. The arrangements which the nations of the free world have made for COLLECTIVE DEFENSE and mutual help are based on the recognition that the concept of national self-sufficiency is now out of date."

This is a most astonishing admission. "The concept of national self-sufficiency is now out of date," means to the soldier, that we can no longer stand alone. Could this be true? Most certainly the Soviet Union can stand alone. And if it—with its enslaved population—can stand alone, then why can't we—who are free—stand alone?

Might we not be in deadly peril, if our defense—our very survival—depends upon others? Have we abandoned our traditional American self-reliance?

Those who are interested in the solvency of our government are bound to

be apprehensive over part of the eighth paragraph of the Eisenhower-Macmillan Agreement.

"8. We recognize that our COLLECTIVE SECURITY efforts must be supported and re-enforced by cooperative economic action."

Beginning with World War I, there has been unprecedented cooperative economic action—especially with NATO—but the aid has always flowed from and never toward America.

Collective Defense is a catch phrase which seems to ring true. Its appeal is elemental, emotional and comforting. But like other support pulling expressions, it has been coined to deceive. Collective Defense, or Collective Security as it is sometimes called, was probably first suggested for American consideration by the DAILY WORKER. On December 22, 1937, Clarence A. Hathaway, Editor of the Daily Worker spoke over CBS Station WABC. His subject was "Collective Security—The Road to Peace." In it he said,

"We urge the people to put pressure on Congress and the Administration for the immediate application of a COLLECTIVE SECURITY Policy."

Incidentally, in his three hour harangue, November 6th, Nikita Khrushchev confirmed the Communist endorsement:

"We appeal to all people, all parliaments to...set up COLLECTIVE SE-

—o— (Continued on Page 2) —o—

MacArthur On Tax Slavery



General Douglas MacArthur

Republished from New York Daily News

The man who won the Pacific war, and could have won in Korea if Truman and Acheson had let him do so, took taxes as the subject of his speech, and what taxes mean to all of us.

His most striking statement:

"Taxes have grown so rapidly in recent years that now they are the largest single item in the cost of living. Americans will pay for government this year more than they will spend on food, clothing, medical care and religious activities combined."

What To Do And How To Do It!

THE ROAD BACK TO SANITY

By P.A. del Valle, Lt. Gen., U.S.M.C. (Ret.)

When the Founding Fathers, under Divine inspiration, framed the American Constitution, they made history. For the first time in this world a government was founded upon the principles and concepts of Christianity. They stated that our rights were derived from God, and not from any worldly king or government. They went further and made it clear that government derived its just powers from the consent of the governed. They gave the Federal Government certain well defined powers, reserving to the sovereign states and to the sovereign people of those states, all powers not thus written into their Constitution. They then divided the powers thus placed in the Federal Government into three co-equal departments, each of which was a check and balance upon the other two.

Under the Constitution this nation became the most prosperous and the greatest power on earth. Then came alien doctrines and alien people confusing us with Eastern sophistries, weakening our Christian faith, and tinkering with our Constitution in



Lt. General P. A. del Valle USMC, (Ret.)

subtle, but deadly fashion. Under guise of "liberalizing" and "modernizing" they managed to evade and change the intent of the Constitution, and to change its concept,

which was Christian, into socialistic theories which are devoid of Godliness, and were sold to us under illusions of a materialistic Utopia upon Earth as an improvement over a Christian spiritual hereafter.

We have seen these changes at work for about 50 years. Millions of our best youth have spilled their blood in wars to end wars which only start new ones. Billions in money representing the inventiveness, the industry, and the productiveness of our people have been and are now being wasted. We are committed to give money to and to defend in war almost every section of the world. Our governmental policies, both foreign and domestic, regardless of party or person in power, seem to emanate from insane asylums. We hear God denied from our very pulpits, and our schools have become a system for the destruction of faith and good order, and patriotism. Treason rides high and finds no challenger. We tremble with fear of nuclear warfare which we developed, but which was treasonably smuggled to our enemies by men who still walk our best streets in freedom and in honor, while men who try to expose them are destroyed.

What to do? Return to the Constitution

—o— (Continued on Page 4) —o—

NATO-Useless

—o— (Continued from Page 1) —o—

CURITY in Europe and Asia."

Following World War II, Secretary of State Dean Acheson presented Collective Defense to the Congress. It was explained that the Collective Concept contemplates that each nation will provide such military means as it is best suited to contribute. Some powers are rich in natural resources, some have huge manpower reserves, others possess industrial genius. By pooling these resources, and integrating them into striking forces, Mr. Acheson claimed that an effective Collective Defense for participating parties would be insured.

Under this Collective Concept NATO came into being. Beginning with the Eisenhower Administration, justifiable alarm over the inexorable rise of Soviet military might has caused our Collective Defense to be expanded. Secretary Dulles—possibly impelled by the herd instinct—has flown over the globe, lavishly passing out American taxpayers money, seeking alignment of peoples to the Free World cause. As a consequence, we now have more than 10,000 Executive Agreements among some 70 odd foreign powers. We have troops in varying strength in 73 countries. A wider dispersion of our surface forces cannot be imagined unless we should occupy Outer Space.

On the other hand, the Soviets keep their forces under close control on the Eurasian land mass. It is far sounder military doctrine than the policy of global dispersion which we are following.

Collective Defense Is Not New

In 1867 Bismark formed the North German Confederation. But the three powerful South German States of Bavaria, Baden and Wurtenburg remained independent. European rulers feared the rising power of the North German Confederation. Against Bismark, Napoleon III reasoned that most of Europe would be on the side of France.

During the spring of 1870, Napoleon III made firm alliances with Austria and Italy. He believed he had positive pledges that the South German States, Spain and Britain would support him, if he struck Bismark's new Prussian Army.

On July 15, 1870, France declared war. Immediately Bavaria, Baden and Wurtenburg joined Bismark. Russia took Austria out of the war by threatening to strike her on the east if she joined France. Britain, Spain and Italy chose neutrality. Without a single ally, Napoleon III fought and lost the war.

The point is that the pledges of the European Powers to Napoleon III were just as binding then, as are the NATO pledges now. Nevertheless, war wrote the answer and France fought ALONE.

In the early spring of 1941, Nazi troops massed in the Balkans threatened Greece. Mr. Churchill, with Greek approval, decided on a British occupation of Greece. Field Marshal Wilson commanded the intervention.

The roads from Yugoslavia into Greece lead through difficult and narrow mountain passes. By skillful use of the terrain, it might be possible, Wilson reasoned, to pile up the invading Nazi in the mountain passes.

A Greek force of 100,000 men had just stopped an Italian invasion on the Albanian front. In northeastern Greece, were 4 divisions which had been recruited locally. Both these forces the Greek King placed at Wilson's disposal. In addition, the British promised 7 divisions and 23 RAF squadrons from Africa.

Passing through Yugoslavia at touring car speed, the Nazi entered northern Greece. The 100,000 Greeks on the Albanian front refused to move to the east because they were determined to finish off the Italians. The 4 Greek divisions in northeastern Greece refused to move to



the west to block the Nazi advance because they preferred to defend their own homes rather than Greek homes elsewhere. Britain sent only two divisions, plus odd units, and 10 RAF squadrons. With heavy losses, the British were thrown out of Greece.

The point of this Greek tragedy is—here were Greeks refusing to move a short distance to defend their own people. Collective Defense was not possible among Greeks themselves. In other words—War wrote the answer to Collective Defense in Greece—as it will in any other war.

In the Korean War, 500,000 South Koreans fought heroically. The United States contributed 450,000 Americans and probably paid most of the bills. All our other U.N. Allies combined contributed a token force which totaled 45,000—a mere 10% of the American effort and less than 5% of the total forces.

Again, the conclusion is inescapable. Collective forces reflect the individual goals, selfishness and vulnerabilities of the powers they represent. Their collective effort varies directly as the threat to their own interests and security.

Despite official praise of NATO—the so-called Shield of Western Europe—the actual defense picture is critical. Today, after six years of preparation, NATO surface forces defending the Rhineland scarcely boast of 15 divisions. NATO Air Power in Europe is decidedly inferior to the Red Air Force. Heralded as the post war answer to the Soviet threat, European NATO today is all but impotent. As a matter of fact, world peace today rests entirely on the American Strategic Air Force which is not even a part of NATO.

But our Collective-minded leaders are not discouraged. Secretary of State Dulles has given us a preview of the program now contemplated. The billions America has already poured into NATO are only the beginning. Bewildered American taxpayers will soon be asked to finance a brand new NATO program.

Mr. Dulles proposes now to place our Intermediate Range Ballistic Missile in the hands of European NATO Powers. If we could not afford adequately to arm Europe with bombers, how can we now afford to arm it with Intermediate Range Ballistic Missiles? This weapon may prove to be just as costly as the bomber. Missiles are not retrievable.

For some time the State Department and other leaders have suggested that nuclear weapons will make the small nations the military equal of the strongest powers. But the bomber and the ballistic missile have radically upset the conventional balance of power among nations. Formerly, manpower, the will to fight, natural and industrial resources, determined military might. Now, nuclear weapons and delivery systems—in being when war

starts—are the true measure of a nation's military strength.

Today, small nations cannot afford even conventional forces. And with the coming of nuclear weapons, the cost is utterly prohibitive. Only two powers—the USSR and the USA are willing to afford such expensive weapons. Consequently, the only way our Allies can possess nuclear capabilities is for the American taxpayer to give them these enormously expensive weapons. And this is exactly what is being proposed.

A London dispatch, dated November 10th, discloses that the United States and Britain seek to draw 50 friendly nations into an anti-communist block. For this action no organization is to be formalized lest it be considered to rival the U.N. But the concept was endorsed in principle at the recent Eisenhower-Macmillan Meeting. Nuclear weapons and guided missile stock piles are to be provided the 50 participating powers. Allies will be given a voice in decisions governing their use. This is militarily faulty. Air Power and Space Power delivered as an entity are indescribably destructive. Parceled among, and controlled by, 50 allies, their potency decreases enormously.

Suppose we were to supply NATO and 35 other friendly powers with missiles for offensive defense. It would be wicked to equip our friends with weapons which would draw enemy fire unless we also provide weapons for their defensive defense. In other words, in order to make the proposed program effective or even workable, European NATO and other countries not only will have to be blanketed with offensive missiles to attack the Kremlin but will also need defensive super-sonic fighter interceptors and anti-missile-missiles for their own defense if they are attacked. To supply NATO and 35 other countries with offensive and defensive weapons would probably cost as much as our entire United States Defense effort.

Let us now suppose that we have supplied NATO Powers and 35 other Allies with adequate offensive and defensive equipment. We have absolutely no assurance that the Soviets would attack Europe. The United States is the only nation blocking the Communists dream of world domination. It is most likely—and it is militarily sound—that if the Reds strike, they will by-pass Europe and strike directly at the United States and our overseas Strategic Air Bases encircling the Soviet Union. Except in Spain, there are no Strategic Air Bases on the European Continent. Our bases in England cannot be used in war without the express consent of the British Prime Minister. Unless attacked, our European Allies might be inclined NOT to strike the Soviet Union but rather be neutral. In this case, they would hold their weapons in reserve, just in case the Red attack against them might come later. Most certainly, to remain neutral and hold their fire would be a human reaction.

Let's make a quick estimate of the possible war combat effectiveness of our three strongest Allies.

France, something like a third communist, has been at futile wars with her colonies for years. It is doubtful if today she has one complete combat division on the NATO front. The French Government is unstable; in war, firm reliance cannot be placed on France.

Britain is dependent upon sea supply for her survival. The Royal Navy now ranks a poor third. Britain is paring her Army to the bone; the RAF is being phased out in favor of missile defense—missiles which are to be provided by us but which do not yet exist! Since a half dozen four-megaton H bombs could destroy Britain, neutrality will look sweet to the British. In war, can we depend upon the availability of our Strategic Air Bases in England?

Western Germany is rearming reluctantly. The Red Air Force and missile program have a 12 year lead on German

preparations. If a war is fought on the ground, Germany is certain to be the initial battlefield. Nuclear weapons might stop a Red invasion of Germany, but the blasting would wipe out the German population. Germany may not be allowed adequately to rearm. As Freda Utley once put it, France wants Germany strong enough to stop the Reds, but not stronger than the French Forces. Germany is divided. Suppose the Kremlin offered a United East-West Germany and, as a price for neutrality, promised not to invade? Where then would be the German effort in the Collective Defense?

The Red Army can overrun Europe; the Red Air Force can destroy Europe; probably the Red Intermediate Range Ballistic Missile can do likewise. Should war come, our European Allies will receive such Soviet punishment as their war effort invites. If they stay out of the way—they may survive. If they are participants to an attack against the Soviet Union, they will be destroyed. And this fact forces one to doubt the wartime value of the Intermediate Range Ballistic Missile in the hands of 50 friendly powers. This certain temptation to be neutral casts doubt on the war availability of many of our overseas bases which encircle the Soviet Union. When war writes the answer, it could be that we shall be forced to rely chiefly on our Western Hemisphere bases.

Self-preservation is the first law of nature. Nations, like individuals, put survival above all else—even treaties. This is no criticism of our Allies. If the Reds strike—only war can write the answer. Under such circumstances, do the American people dare subscribe to the Eisenhower-Macmillan Agreement that "THE CONCEPT OF NATIONAL SELF-SUFFICIENCY IS NOW OUT OF DATE"?

Collective Security introduces a political weakness. When one nation becomes a member of the Collective, it is apt to lose control of its own destiny. This actually happened in Korea. There we could have won the war, but our U.N. Allies, with varied global interests, could not agree to such a victory. We shall yet pay for our Korean compromise.

Grave Economic Dangers Arise Out Of The Eisenhower-Macmillan Agreement

Our finances are in poor shape. Our debt of \$275 billion is said to be less than half our actual true financial burden.

To equip NATO and possibly 35 other countries so as to be armed against the Soviet Union will cost more billions than our leaders dare to announce. Yet, it would not be surprising if the President promises—while in Paris this month—a new multi-billion dollar Eisenhower Plan for NATO and the Free World.

The need to strengthen our own defenses is desperate. If war is thrust upon America, our own American forces must be able to win—with what is left—after a Red sneak attack. The only way we can adequately defend ourselves and our Allies is to prevent war from happening. The Soviet Union is the base from which must emanate the Kremlin's effort for world domination. Destruction of this base will not be risked IF America is stronger than the Red Forces.

The cost of adequate defense of our own homeland will be enormous. We must have more Intercontinental bombers and North American bases. We must add the ICBM to our arsenal. We must create our own defense against Red bombers and Red ICBM. Again the cost will be terrific. Nevertheless, if we curtail spending for conventional surface warfare in Europe and stop Foreign Aid, adequate defense is possible at a material saving—even as much as \$10 Billion—in our present defense expenditure. A super multi-billion dollar Foreign Aid program, however, would be the straw that breaks the camel's back. The value of the dollar probably would drop enormously. The inflationary spiral would rise toward the orbit of Sputnik. Remember, the Kremlin intends to

win by collapsing our economy.

Unless and until we have created a decisive air and space advantage over the Soviets, and until our defense is adequate, not one dime should be spent for Foreign Aid. This would entail no abrupt cutoff to our Allies. There are now some \$10 billions of unexpended Foreign Aid funds to cushion the shock of this proposed cut.

To put Foreign Aid ahead of our own defense for survival would be suicidal to both ourselves and our Allies.

Then there is a final and grave misgiving. The Department of State appears to have a strange fascination for the Collective Concept. Could it be that the motivating spirit of this entire Collective effort is a passion for World Government? Are Foreign Aid and the deployment of troops in some 70 countries a manifestation of One Worldism rather than actually for OUR OWN AMERICAN Defense?

It is disturbing to realize that both our Secretary of State and our President have expressed an affinity for the Super-State.

On February 26, 1941, Mr. John Foster Dulles, then a Member of Sullivan and Cromwell, prepared a confidential draft for Mr. C.K. Streit, author of UNION NOW WITH BRITAIN. The draft, according to Mr. Streit, was "to serve as a basis for soundings and informed discussions" on the creation of "THE UNION" of the British Commonwealth and the United States. "THE UNION" was to have power to determine peace and war, make treaties and exercise all other attributes of sovereignty. Our entry into the Union, of course, would have terminated the sovereignty of the United States.

By 1942, Mr. Dulles had gone a step further. He then endorsed:

"Ultimately, 'a world government of delegated powers.'

"Strong immediate limitations on national sovereignty.

"International control of all Armies and Navies.

"A universal system of money..."

"World-wide freedom of immigration.

"Progressive elimination of all tariff."

In his book, CRUSADE IN EUROPE, General Eisenhower recommended, "a central and joint agency" to decide disputes among powers by a majority vote. There after, the agency "shall have the power and means to enforce its decision."

Our danger lies in the fact that Internationalism—under the guise of Collective Defense—now sounds the dominant tone of our leadership.

Under World Government, what would happen to the United States can be stated quite simply: The United States would be disarmed. The United States would be bankrupt. The American people would have lost their liberty. When American Liberty dies, Freedom is dead everywhere.

Released by FOR AMERICA,
1001 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Wash., D.C.
Hon. J. Bracken Lee, Natl. Chairman
Dean Clarence Manion, Vice Chairman
Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, Natl. Director
Mr. George A. Starbird, Treasurer

**FIVE COMMON
SENSE TO ONE
ADDRESS \$3.00
PER YEAR.**

Common Sense*

Union, New Jersey, U. S. A.

Conde McGinley, Editor

\$1 for 30 copies, \$3 for 100, \$10 for 500

One year's subscription, \$1. Three years for \$2.50

First Class (Sealed)—\$3.00 per year

FOREIGN 10 MONTHS \$1.00

Common Sense*

Published twice monthly at

530 Chestnut St. Union, New Jersey, U.S.A.

*Trade Mark Registered United States Patent Office

IKE MEETS MACMILLAN

The New York Herald Tribune, in their issues of December 4, 1957, relates that Prime Minister Macmillan states that Lewis Strauss (Zionist) arranged his meeting with President Eisenhower and GENERATED most of the ideas that made it successful!

In reading the following letter by Mr. Dresser, a distinguished attorney, it is well to bear in mind that Strauss, a Zionist, has been a member of Kuhn Loeb Co. for many years. It was Jacob Schiff, then president of Kuhn Loeb Co., Jewish Bankers, who financed the communist revolution in Russia in 1917. His grand-daughter, Dorothy Schiff, is now publisher of the Zionist New York Post.—Editor

Dear Senator:

The Eisenhower-Macmillan Joint Statement as reported in the press on Saturday, October 26, 1957, contains the following provisions:

"In application of these ideas, and as an example which we believe can and should spread among the nations of the free world, we reached the following understanding:

"1. The arrangements which the nations of the free world have made for collective defense and mutual help are based on the recognition that the concept of national self-sufficiency is now out of date. The countries of the free world are interdependent and only in genuine partnership, by combining their resources and sharing tasks in many fields, can progress and safety be found. For our part, we have agreed that our two countries will henceforth act in accordance with this principle.

"2. Our representatives to the North Atlantic Council will urge an enlarged Atlantic effort in scientific research and development in support of greater collective security and the expansion of current activities of the task force working in this field under the council's decision of last December.

"8. We recognize that our collective security must be supported and reinforced by cooperative economic action. The present offers a challenging opportunity for improvement of trading conditions and the expansion of trading conditions and the expansion of trade throughout the free world. It is encouraging that plans are developing for a European free trade area in association with the European Common Market. We recognize that especially in the less-developed countries there should be a steady and significant increase in standards of living and economic development."

These provisions raise some important questions. Do they indicate an intention to establish a partial World Government not only for military but also for economic purposes?

Is it intended that our foreign aid program shall be expanded still further and made permanent by our sharing our wealth with the other members of the world organization and the still further removal of our tariff restrictions on foreign imports?

If this is the meaning of the statement, it is of the highest importance that the subject be thoroughly debated and the American people made aware of the nature of the proposal.

In his broadcast Friday night (October 25, 1957) Fulton Lewis, Jr. stated that the understanding or arrangement was to be made effective by Executive Agreement, and not by Treaty. The former, of course, requires action by the President alone, while a Treaty requires approval by the Senate by a two-thirds vote. Submission to the Senate would presumably arouse substantial opposition, which the Administration may wish to avoid. If this is a fact, it is a most disturbing circumstance.

In reaching a conclusion as to the

—o— (Continued on Page 4) —o—

EISENHOWER

—o— (Continued from Page 3) —o—

desirability of the proposed arrangement, it seems not inappropriate to consider the following points:

1. That Great Britain, while having at the present time a so-called "conservative" government, is highly socialized and recent elections to the House of Commons indicate that the Socialist Labor Party may well be returned to power at the next general election. Such leaders of this Party as Aneurin Bevan have shown a marked disposition to collaborate with Russia, despite the latter's manifest intention to obtain domination of the world.

2. It was the British scientist Klaus Fuchs who, while in this country on a friendly mission with other British scientists, stole the secrets of our atomic bomb and transmitted them to Russia, thereby hastening by an untold number of years Russia's development of the bomb.

3. The shipment of strategic materials by Britain to Communist China during the Korean War, which was carried on to such an extent as to lead to a petition by a number of Members of Congress that steps be taken to stop it.

4. The part that Great Britain and our other allies in the United Nations took in preventing our winning the Korean War, an achievement that would have led to the downfall of the Communist regime in China and would have completely changed the world situation in our favor.

5. The continued recognition by Britain of the Communist Government in China.

6. The relaxing by Britain of her restrictions on trade with Russia.

7. The serious economic conditions in Great Britain brought on by her tragic experiment in Socialism, and the large-scale emigration from Britain, particularly among the able and educated young people who are fleeing from the Welfare State.

8. The use of the billions of dollars that we have given Britain since the war in nationalizing her industries and in maintaining her socialist government in power during much of this period.

9. For some time it has seemed that there was a desire on the part of certain elements in our government to make this country a part of an international organization. This has been manifested by the persistent attempts by the State Department to secure the delegation to an international body of powers given by the Constitution to our own Congress. Examples of this are OTC and GATT, and the International Atomic Energy Agency. These actions have led many to wonder whether we are being led into a World government by easy stages.

These, I think, are some of the things that should be considered in any discussion of the Eisenhower-Macmillan Agreement.

It would seem clear that no such arrangement should be entered into by mere Executive Agreement. Certainly, the Senate should be given an opportunity to debate the question.

Very sincerely yours,
Robert B. Dresser

He's Right

"FROM FEAR OF POLITICAL REPRISAL, NOT A SINGLE UNITED STATES SENATOR NOR REPRESENTATIVE HAS THE GUTS TO STAND ON HIS FEET AND TELL THE AMERICAN PEOPLE THE TRUTH ABOUT COMMUNISM AND THE UNITED NATIONS AND WHO'S BEHIND IT!"

John G. Crommelin
Rear Admiral U.S. Navy (Retired)

What To Do

—o— (Continued from Page 1) —o—

and its Christian concepts. How to do it? Begin with repeal of the FEDERAL RESERVE ACT., whereby our Congress surrendered unconstitutionally to a group of international bankers, the control of our money. From there to the repeal of the equally unconstitutional Income Tax Law, a concept of Karl Marx. We proceed step by step to restore the Constitution and we return to Sanity. But first and most important, the people, through its Congressional representatives, should recover their money power. The rest will be easy. Remember that the most powerful international banking group in the world has this motto: **LET US CONTROL THE MONEY OF ANY COUNTRY AND WE CARE NOT WHO MAKES ITS LAWS.** Write, telephone and telegraph to our representatives in Congress, at least once a week, until they wake up and regain their most important power from the greedy hands of aliens to whom Christian, free America is anathema. Remember Plato's old saw: **"THE PENALTY GOOD MEN PAY FOR NOT TAKING AN INTEREST IN POLITICS IS TO BE GOVERNED BY EVIL MEN."**

Republished from **RIGHT**, the monthly newsletter.—Box 180, San Francisco 1, Cal.

Where We Are

It is difficult for some people to see that a group of Pharisees, or Zionists, as they are known today, have set up an invisible government which operates to confuse and destroy the U.S. government which is known and seen by most of the gullible taxpayers. FDR, who triggered off most of our headaches, once said: "things do not happen; they are planned that way." Speaking of FDR—wonder what happened to the **"FOUR FREEDOMS"** we supposedly fought for in the last war? hmmm...Ed..

Reprinted from
McKeesport, Pa., Daily News

Twice within this generation the United States has stood at the absolute pinnacle of world power, influence and respect. The first instance came with our victory in World War I; the second as Japan bowed to the inevitable and surrendered in 1945.

At the close of World War I, the U.S. was the only major nation in full and prosperous operation, undamaged by the conflict. Britain and France, the western allies of the time, and the beaten Central Powers of Europe were exhausted. Russia was in the throes of a revolution.

In this situation, the U.S. was in a position to compel a just and lasting peace—a peace that might have held for a century. But the U.S. missed its chance. Instead of a lasting peace, we got a decade of runaway inflation, the worst depression in history, an age of strident dictators and finally a war more terrible than the one our victory ended.

Why did this country in defiance of fateful opportunity, fail? There have been many answers advanced, but only one suffices. Instead of compelling a workable peace, we approached the task with a philosophy of self-negation—the notion that we wanted nothing for ourselves, not even firm guarantees of our national security—and our minds full of realistic illusions.

This philosophy and these illusions, no matter how nice the philosophy sounded and how inspiring were the illusions, simply did not work. At Versailles, the greeds and the revenge lusts of cunning men ripped our peace program to shreds and we retreated—the most powerful nation on earth—from the conference table, bewildered and grasping only the impossibility of Woodrow Wilson's promised League of Nations which, in turn, was rejected at home. We should have been more

practical.

As the guns stilled in World War II, the U.S. stood supreme again. Western Europe was in shambles. The Soviet Union was propped up by our lend-lease billions in the wreckage of Stalingrad and her eastern industrial cities. Still, even before the end of that war, our opportunity was thrown away. At Teheran and again at Yalta and, finally, at Potsdam our enduring idealism had done us in.

We should give Russia, heartland of the communist world conspiracy, everything she asked and ask nothing in return, proclaimed our peacemakers as they proceeded to concede, without guarantees and with no strings attached, the victory to the Soviet, carrying away only the idealism of the United Nations which quickly became incompetent in reality and, indeed, a colossal fraud.

Since then, we've seen, in a steady run of idealistic blunders, the position of this nation descend until, as of this moment, we are trapped on war brinks in the Middle East, where the intemperance of a camel-path country could plunge us into nuclear holocaust, castigated almost daily from the U.N. forum established on our soil, despised in a rising wave of un-Americanism everywhere, and, in the most unbelievable occurrence of all, disputed in our once firm claims of scientific and technical leadership.

How did this come about? Why did we win two wars and promptly lose the peace? How has the U.N. become the sounding board against which the most scandalous of lies are daily hurled against us? Why, when we have given billions of our substance freely to everybody who asked it, are we despised? How, when we have spent more on military preparations than the rest of the world combined, has a little ball, soaring in the upper air, tipped the judgment of the so-called neutrals in favor of an evil movement which terms itself our mortal enemy?

These are questions which should be asked now. Some of them should have been asked before as we proceeded on, humiliating ourselves in a Korean war which we could have won, entangling ourselves everywhere with Mr. Dulles' fantastic notions of collective security, ladling out billions in a foreign aid program which we do not know how to stop, and piling up our debt and costs to proportions beyond our ability even to comprehend.

And where are we? We are worse off now than we were a month ago and much worse off than we were a year ago. And we are infinitely worse off than we were as we stood honored, courted and endowed with vast opportunity at the close of World War II. We are where we are for only one reason and that is the ridiculous philosophy which we have followed—the now proved absurdities of playing the role of Uncle Sam instead of the hard-minded, practical Uncle Sam of bygone eras in a still evil and still dangerous world at large.

**HELP SPREAD TRUTH
HELP US SURPRISE
THE PLOTTERS WITH
A MILLION READERS.**

Read and pass on!

OUR THREAT IS FROM THE INSIDIOUS FORCES WORKING FROM WITHIN WHICH HAVE ALREADY SO DRASTICALLY ALTERED THE CHARACTER OF OUR FREE INSTITUTIONS.

—Douglas MacArthur